



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The Ode in Isaiah xiv.

WILLIAM HENRY COBB.

BOSTON, MASS.

IN his Introduction to Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, Professor Cheyne remarks on Is. xxix. 5-8 :

The question can only be argued profitably by those who have assimilated the principles of the school of Stade and Wellhausen, and who in considering the prophecies in the Book of Isaiah ask themselves, not, Is there any reason why this or that prophecy should not be by Isaiah? but, What is the period in which, by historical or social situation, language, rhythm, and ideas, the composition of the prophecy can most easily be understood?

In like manner, we may regard the ode before us as simply a specimen to be investigated, and the first thing to do is to isolate it for examination. We find it marked off from its context, with only a narrow penumbra on either side. For whether the poem closes with vs. 21, 22, or 23, the following verses, 24-27, are regarded by all as celebrating the downfall of Sennacherib, whoever was their author. Again, when we turn to the first three verses of the chapter, although critics are not so united, it can be readily shown that those verses are intruded between our passage and ch. xiii. There are marks of editorial activity in xiv. 1-3. Bredenkamp in 1887 pointed out the inconsistency of this passage with the historical situation assumed in ch. xiii. Dillmann's reply (1890) assumes the integrity of xiv. 1-23 ; but this is denied by Duhm (1892), who regards these introductory verses as the work of a later hand, dependent on Zechariah and others. There is much force in Duhm's argument that the spirit of these verses accords well with postexilic Judaism. There is the same Pharisaic exclusiveness, that makes the world exist for Israel rather than Israel for the world. In contrast with the Messianic promise of blessing to all the nations, these are to conduct the dispersion home in pomp, and for their reward are to be put under the feet of Israel as servants and housemaids. The *Ger* is introduced in

vs. 1, the proselyte, who is to cleave to the house of Jacob, that is, he receives permission to intermarry with the chosen race. The rest from hard service in vs. 3 is gained by putting that service upon Israel's former masters. These oppressors are not the Babylonians, but the heathen in general, under whose supremacy the Diaspora is living. To connect such hopes of retaliation with a prophecy against Babylon is precisely what the later Jews were always doing, down to, and even beyond, the time of the New Testament Apocalypse, "in bekannter unhistorischer Weise" (Duhm's phrase).

I think the dependence of these verses upon the first two chapters of Zechariah is much closer than Duhm indicates ; in fact, the former seem to be almost wholly a cento of quotations from the latter. Thus we have the parallel clauses :

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| IS. XIV. 1,       | <i>For Jahve will have compassion on Jacob ;</i>  |
| ZECH. I. 16,      | Thus saith Jahve : I am returned to Jerusalem with compassions.   |
| IS.,              | <i>and will yet choose Israel and set them in their own land ;</i>  |
| ZECH. I. 17,      | My cities through prosperity shall yet be spread abroad ; and Jahve shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem.   |
| ZECH. II. 16,     | And Jahve shall inherit Judah as his portion in the holy land, and shall yet choose Jerusalem.  |
| IS.,              | <i>and the stranger shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob ;</i>   |
| ZECH. II. 15,     | And many nations shall join themselves to Jahve in that day, and shall be my people.  |
| IS.,              | <i>and the house of Israel shall possess them in Jahve's land for servants and for handmaids ; and they shall capture their captors and rule their oppressors.</i>  |
| ZECH. II. 12, 13, | After glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you ; for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. For behold I will shake mine hand over them ; and they shall be a spoil to those that served them. |

The whole conception in Zechariah is very animated, beginning at i. 12 with the angel's question : "Jahve Sebaoth, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these seventy years?" and continued with answering voices, and with the visions of the four horns and the measuring line. The expressions I have quoted come in naturally and are evidently original ; it is impossible that Zechariah can be dependent on Is. xiv. ; the dependence is the reverse, and therefore Is. xiv. 1-3 is postexilic. But no postexilic copyist or editor

could have written the magnificent ode that follows. The contrast is heaven-wide between the prose of vs. 1-3 and the poetry beginning at vs. 4<sup>b</sup>. There are but few poems in all literature that rise to sublimity; and this is one of them. Its date and author are to be ascertained if possible by a careful study of its contents in their various relations.

On the introductory passage, I have only two things to add: first, that since the poem opens in the middle of vs. 4, the phrase מֶלֶךְ בְּבֶל in 4<sup>a</sup> may also be an editorial addition, as it is regarded by Duhm, Winckler, Cheyne, and others; and second, that the *māshāl* having been thus separated from its context, we are to examine it by itself, unbiassed by any pre-judgment derived from the mention of the Medes in ch. xiii., or from that of the captivity in xiv. 1-3. As Cheyne observes of ch. xiii. and xiv. (*Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 75), there are such differences in their pictures of the judgment, and there is so much more poetic heat in the ode than in the prophecy, that the conjecture of a twofold authorship is reasonable.

The next step is to free our specimen from imperfections, restoring it, as well as possible, to its original form. It is remarkable that the beautiful rhythm should have been hidden so long from the generations of acute students of Isaiah. Lowth in the last century came close to the true form; Ewald, Ley, and Bickell made further approximations; but Budde was the first, I think, to bring out the measure so clearly that all can see and hear it. His article "Das hebräische Klagelied" (*ZATW.*, 1882) investigated the structure of the Book of Lamentations, and found its prevailing verse-form finely illustrated in the ode before us. Ten years later, in the same journal, he speaks of his view, doubtless with too great positiveness, as now a commonplace of biblical science. I cannot but regard it as genuinely scientific, if not yet commonplace.

Keeping the word *verse* to its usual sense when Scripture is quoted (by chapter and verse), and employing the word *line* to denote a verse of poetry, we find that a verse may contain more or fewer lines, but that each line in this ode has five accents, the cesura falling regularly after the third beat. The rule is not Procrustean, but the exceptions are slight and reasonable, and such as a modern poet might make. There are seven lines in a strophe, and five full strophes with perhaps part of a sixth. The first begins at 4<sup>b</sup>, thus:

שָׁכַתָּה מְרֵהָבָה:

|

אֵיךְ שָׁכַתָּה נִשְׁשׁ

This last word should be altered to מְרִהָבָה, 'arrogance'; so most ancients and moderns.

Verse 11 has two lines :

הַמֶּנֶת נִבְלִיָּד		הוֹרֵר שְׂאוֹל גָּאוֹן
וּמִכְסִּיף תוֹלַעַה :		תַּחֲתִיד יָצַע רִמָּה

Verse 13 has three lines :

הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲעֵלָה		וְאֶתָּה אֲמַרְתָּ בְּלִבְבְּךָ
אֲרִים פָּסָא		מִמַּעַל לְבוֹכְבְּרָאֵל
בְּיִרְבָּתִי צִפּוֹן :		וְאֲשֹׁב בְּהִרְמוֹעַד

Certainly there is metrical method in this composition, even if we do not venture to call it elegiac pentameter, after Julius Ley, whom Budde rebukes thus (*ZATW.*, 1882, p. 5) : "Er ordnet ihn seinem System ein unter dem ebenso pompösen als misverständlichen und im Grunde unrichtigen Namen des *elegischen Pentameters*." The poet may use his license either to emphasize, or to glide over, a small word; לָךְ is treated in both ways at vs. 9. The third line in that verse illustrates Budde's case 2, where two weighty words take the place of the usual three words, הַקִּים מִכְסָּאוֹתָם. We may also apply that principle, though we need not, at the end of vs. 13, just quoted, וְאֲשֹׁב בְּהִרְמוֹעַד. I think that Budde's musical ear deserts him when he attempts the same explanation in the second line of vs. 12; נִגְדַעְתָּ לְאַרְץ is a different movement entirely. But so far as I know, all versions repeat the word *how* at this point. Supply אֵיךְ as Duhm does in his text, and the whole strophe (the third in the ode, extending from vs. 12 to vs. 15 inclusive) is perfectly regular. It is not necessary to print the lines, for one cannot go astray on the rhythm. Those who are still sceptical as to the existence of true metre in Hebrew, would do well to go through the scansion of this strophe.

At the close of vs. 8, Budde's case 3 occurs, the pause in sense falling after the second beat, with a rhetorical pause after the third. How natural this is becomes plain when we put the whole verse into English :

The fir-trees exulting accost thee | and Lebanon's cedars :

Since thou art laid low | there comes not || the woodman against us.

Going back to vs. 5, we note that the word *Jahve* is superfluous in the rhythm and unnecessary to the sense ; no one could doubt *who* had humbled the pride of the king ; it is like the poet to say, " He hath broken the staff of the wicked," and like the scribe to insert the proper name. The first part of vs. 10, " all they shall answer and say unto thee," is regarded by some as a marginal note, and printed as prose. The difficulty with this is that it reduces the strophe to six lines, while the others have seven. Moreover, by supplying a single word, the regular rhythm is preserved. Duhm and Cheyne mark the elision, but suggest nothing to fill it. If we read רָאִי before בָּלָם, it will form an assonance with אֱלֹיךָ, as in vs. 16. With these slight emendations, it is easy to verify the metre of the first two strophes.

STROPHE I., VS. 4<sup>b</sup>-8.

אֵיךְ שָׁבַת נָגַשׁ	שָׁבַתָּה מִרְהָבָה :
שָׁכַר מָטָה רְשָׁעִים	שָׁכַט מַשְׁלִים :
מָכָה עַמִּים בְּעֶבְרָה	מִבַּת בְּלִת־סָרָה
רָדָה בְּאֶפֶס גִּזְיִם	מִרְדָּף בְּלִת־שָׁד :
נָחָה שְׁקֻטָּה בְּלִת־אֶרֶץ	פָּצְחוּ רָנָה :
גַּם־בְּרוּשִׁים שָׁמְחוּ לָךְ	אֶרְוִי לִבְנוֹן
מֵאֲזוּ שָׁכַבְתָּ לֹא־יִעָלָה	הַבֵּרַת עָלֵינוּ :

## STROPHE II., VS. 9-11.

שָׂאוּל מִתַּחַת הַנֹּזֶה־לָךְ	לִקְרֹאת בּוֹאֵךְ
עוֹרֵר לָךְ רָפָאִים	בְּלִי־עֲשׂוֹדֵי אֶרֶץ
הִקְוִים מִבְּסֻאוֹתָם	בְּלִי־מִלְכֵי גִזְיִם :
רָאִיךְ בָּלָם יַעֲנֵי	וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֶיךָ
גַּם־אֲתָה חֲלִיתָ כְּמוֹנִי	אֲלֵינוּ נִמְשָׁלָתָ :
הוֹרֵר שָׂאוּל גְּאוֹנֶךָ	הֶמְנַת נִבְלִיךָ
תַּחֲתֶיךָ יָצַע רָמָה	וַיִּבְכְּסִיךָ תוֹלַעָה :

All runs smoothly now to the close of vs. 17, where בִּיתָה disturbs the metre ; besides, it is awkward to say that one lets loose prisoners home. Budde makes the word form a doublet with בְּבִיתוֹ at the end of vs. 18, the latter being the true conclusion of 17. This at once restores both verses to regularity, though it is a question whether this is not secured at too high a price. Cheyne's way

suits me better ; to drop בִּיתָהּ and read over into the next verse. Thus we have the following fine contrast :

His captives he set not free | all the kings of the nations.  
*They* all are resting in glory | each one in his house,  
 Whilst *thou* art cast out from thy grave | like a branch abhorred.

When we reflect upon the long succession of copyists who were totally unsuspecting of any metrical arrangement, the wonder is, not that we stumble here and there upon a hard scansion, but that the poem is preserved in a form so nearly perfect. Verse 19, however, is very obscure as it stands ; some correction is necessary, for not only is the rhythm distorted, but the text is impossible. It is sufficient, I think, following Ewald and others, to take out the words near the close אֶל־אֲבִנֵי־בֹר, and put them at the beginning of vs. 20, translating 19 thus :

Whilst thou art cast out from thy grave | like a branch abhorred ;  
 As the garb of the sword-pierced slain ; | like a corpse trodden down.

Here comes in Budde's case 1, its only occurrence in the ode. It is where the first member of a line is prolonged to four beats in two couplets :

לְבַשְׁתֶּרְוִים ॥ מִטְּעִי־תֶרֶב

Passing to vs. 20, and beginning, as above, with יִרְדִּי, etc., we may either, with Dillmann, elide בְּקִבּוּרָה, as inserted after the change just mentioned, or, with Budde, combine it with the previous word, in which case לֹא־תִחַד בְּקִבּוּרוֹתָם will closely resemble Gen. xlix. 6 (בְּקִדְלָם אֶל־תִּחַד), these being the only two occurrences of the Qal of יָחַד. Either way improves both meaning and metre. I prefer Budde's : "They that go down to the stones of the pit, thou shalt not join in their burial." Verse 21 follows the metre, except that the last word עָרִים is superfluous, and withal very difficult : "fill the face of the world with cities," an apparent contradiction to vs. 17. This has given rise to a fine crop of conjectures. Duhm sets these aside, one after another, assigning no reasons, and himself cuts the knot with equal arbitrariness by assuming that עָרִים is a variant for פְּנִיתֵי־תֵבֵל. At the same time, he prints the next line with one beat missing at the beginning. Cheyne (*Introduction*, p. 74) remarks :

"No theory can induce me to omit עָרִים or rather אַיִם." (The last word is evidently a slip for עִיִּים, 'ruins,' a conjecture that goes back to Hitzig.) I suggest ending the verse with פָּנִי־תִבָּל, and beginning vs. 22 with a substitute for עָרִים, namely אָעִיר, the Hiphil of עִיר: "I will stir myself up." This precise form, although perfectly regular, does not happen to occur elsewhere, but we have אָעִירָה (Ps. lvii. 9, cviii. 3). With this emendation, the verse begins: "I will stir myself up and arise against them." Cf. Ps. xxxv. 23: "Stir thyself up and awake to my judgment," where the verb is the same, the Hiphil of עִיר. For the sense, cf. Is. xxxiii. 10: "Now will I arise, saith Jahve; now will I lift up myself," and especially Is. xxxi. 2: "[Jahve] will bring evil, and . . . will arise against the house of the evil-doers." For both form and sense cf. Job viii. 6: "If thou wert pure and upright, surely now he would awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous." Jahve awakes [עִיר] for the upright, and *against* the evil-doers. When we have made this correction, not only is the rhythm of vs. 21 perfect, but vs. 22 is no longer prose; it forms two good lines which just finish out the fifth strophe; there being a single word of editorial addition, לִבְבָּל. Most recent critics maintain the prosaic character of both 22 and 23. Budde says very positively: "They are prophetic prose, that has nothing to do with this rhythm"; Cheyne: "They stand outside the poem and are in a very inelegant style." Dillmann goes into particulars, giving four reasons against incorporating them into the poem: (1) the fact that Jahve speaks here, not before; (2) the altered object of discourse, Babel; (3) the expression נָאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת; (4) the faulty elegiac rhythm. Of these, (1) the change of speakers has no pertinence; for we shall find such a change in every strophe. (2) The change of object is removed by the amended text, dropping לִבְבָּל, which also disposes of (4) the imperfect rhythm. (3) The double refrain, first נָאֻם יְהוָה and then נָאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, seems to me highly poetical and appropriate, bringing the ode to a solemn close with three beats in each half-line. We may now verify the last strophe as follows:

## STROPHE V., VS. 20-22.

לֹא־תִתֵּד בְּקִבּוּרֹתָם	יִזְרְי אֶל־אֲבִיבֹר
עַמֶּךָ תִּרְנֶנֶת	כִּי אֶרְצֶה שְׁחַת
זֶרַע מְרֻשִׁים:	לֹא יִקְרָא לְשִׁילָם



בְּעֵץ אֲבוֹתָם	הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מִטְבַּחַת
וּמִלְאֵי פְּנֵי־תֵבֵל :	בְּלִי־קִמּוֹ וּרְשׁוֹ אֶרֶץ
נָאִם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	אֲשֶׁר וְקִמְתִּי עָלֵיהֶם
וְנִין וְנֶכֶד נָאִם יְהוָה :	וְהִכְרַתִּי שֵׁם וְשָׂאֵר

Verse 23, so far as the form goes, might be brought into rhythm, but it reads more like prose; it is to this rather than 22 that Cheyne's charge of inelegant style belongs. It evidently refers to the city of Babylon, and describes its doom. The simplest hypothesis is that the editor attached it to the previous prophecy, inserting לְבָבֶל in vs. 22 to form a point of attachment for the feminine suffixes. We may safely fix the limits of the ode at vs. 4<sup>b</sup> and the close of vs. 22.

Glancing back over the poem, we observe the dramatic action throughout. In the first strophe the trees speak: "Since thou art laid low, the woodman cometh not up against us." In the second strophe the shades speak: "Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us?" In the third strophe the king speaks in his heart: "I will ascend into heaven," etc. In the fourth strophe the spectators speak: "Is this the man that made the earth to tremble?" etc. In the fifth strophe the prophet speaks: "Prepare ye slaughter for his children," etc.; and finally Jahve speaks in his own person: "I will stir myself up and arise against them."

The ode as restored says nothing about a city, but is a song of triumph and derision over the fall of some king. Will the contents help us to decide what king this is?

#### a. *He was an Oppressive Tyrant.*

Verse 4, the oppressor, the arrogance (מְרִיבָהּ).

" 12, thou who didst lay low the nations.

" 20, thou hast destroyed thy land, slain thy people.

#### b. *He was a World-Ruler.*

Verse 6, that smote peoples in wrath, that ruled nations in anger.

" 7, the whole earth is at rest (at thy downfall).

" 16, the man that made the earth (הָאָרֶץ) to tremble, that did shake kingdoms.

" 17, that made the world (תֵּבֵל) like the wilderness, and overthrew its cities.

c. *He was Famous for Pomp and Pride.*

Verse 11, thy pomp is brought down to Sheol.

“ 13, I will ascend into heaven; I will lift up my throne above the stars of El.

“ 14, I will ascend above the cloud-heights; I will be like Elyon.

d. *He was brought to an Inglorious End.*

Verse 4, How art thou brought down to the ground! (*i.e.*, to the underworld; cf. [with Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 18] Ex. xv. 12; Eccl. iii. 21; Is. xxix. 4, etc.)

“ 10, Art thou become weak as we are?

“ 15, brought down to Sheol, to the uttermost parts of the abyss.

“ 19, cast away from thy sepulchre . . . as a carcass trodden under foot.

“ 20, not joined with them in burial, (his seed) not named for ever.

Is there any historical king who answers to these marks? or are we to refer the prophecy to the generic king as a comprehensive term for the people and power of a nation? This last is affirmed by Dillmann, but denied by most others. The individual traits in our prophecy are very clear; probably the generic theory would never have been invented but for the supposed necessities of the passage. At all events the traits described must characterize individuals before they can be predicated of a class. Now I make bold to affirm that there never was a king of *Babylon*, from Nebuchadnezzar to Nabonidus, who can be made to fit this description. The old explanation, which connects it with the violent overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus and the shameful death of Belshazzar the king, has at least two defects — no such overthrow took place, and Belshazzar was not the king. As for Nebuchadnezzar, he was a master-builder, both in the literal and the political sense; and very far from being a cruel oppressor. “Thou hast destroyed thy land, thou hast slain thy people,” is utterly inapplicable to him. Nabonidus has been suggested, because, according to his inscriptions, he cut down cedars in Lebanon. But many other kings did the same thing; and as for the main picture, there could not be a greater misfit. Nabonidus was a weak antiquarian, whose chief energy was expended in rebuilding ancient temples. Hommel says that this archæological fad, which allured him into forgetfulness of the entire world without, and blinded him to approaching danger, finally cost him throne and freedom. Compare Tiele's almost pathetic picture of the unwarlike king, deep in his digging and building, while his kingdom was exposed to ruin.

The satire of our ode, "Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms?" if meant of Nabonidus, would have made its author immortal — as a laughing-stock.

There are, however, world-rulers, with whom Jewish writers were concerned, that correspond better with the qualities depicted in Is. xiv. More than forty years ago, Frederick Maurice wrote to Sir Edward Strachey: "The fact I am chiefly confident about in Isaiah is that the description in the fourteenth chapter exactly answers to Sennacherib, and not the least to Nebuchadnezzar or Belshazzar." In 1894, Hugo Winckler published his *Altorientalische Forschungen*, containing a note which is so brief and important that I give it in full:

"Isaiah xiv. 4-23 is according to Budde (*ZATW.* ii., 12 ff.) an elegy, and differs in metre from xiii. 1-xiv. 3, with which it has been united into a single oracle. The latter is the prophecy against Babylon, incorrectly joined, perhaps by its author, to our piece. It is in the true Isaian style, though one attempts the impossible if he would honor Isaiah with the authorship of the whole. But as soon as we give weight to the metre of the elegy, the two compositions, since they differ so widely, must of necessity be separated. xiv. 4-21 (not 23) is an elegy; meant, to be sure (see Budde), to be taken ironically, hence a *māshāl*, on the death of the king of Assyria, and not of the king of Babylon, and it proceeds from Isaiah himself. Since it plainly portrays a violent death, there is scarcely a doubt that the murder of Sennacherib in the year 682 is meant, which (cf. *Altorientalische Untersuchungen*, pp. 41-46) took place after he had been compelled to withdraw from Palestine. By this is explained too the 'close relationship in contents and form' [this phrase he quotes from Budde] with the song of Isaiah in 2 Ki. xix. 21-28 (see Klostermann on that passage, Duhm on Is. xxxvii. 25) which has long been noticed. Both songs belong to the same period and were not long separated in composition. The one treats of the *speedy* overthrow of Sennacherib, the other of the same as accomplished."<sup>1</sup>

Upon this Cheyne comments thus (*Introduction*, p. 75):

"How an advanced critic like Winckler can regard the poem as Isaiah's song of triumph on the death of Sennacherib is a mystery. Phraseology and ideas are alike opposed to this hasty view, and the parallelisms in xiv. 8, 13, 14 to passages of the taunt-song on Senna-

<sup>1</sup> The substance of this paper of mine was read at a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, June 1, 1894, before I had seen Winckler's book.

cherib in xxxvii. 22<sup>b</sup>–29 simply show that both poems proceed from the same (late) school of poets. It is also most unlikely that Isaiah expected that Sennacherib would be ‘cast far from his grave.’ Both prophecy and ode, then, are not earlier than the close of the Exile.”

Whether or not this is a “hasty view” and whether phraseology and ideas oppose or favor it, we shall soon be better able to determine. As to the phrase “cast far from his grave,” which appears in quotation marks, Cheyne forgets (in the haste of his view?) that his own revised text omits it. Also, it is not a conservative reactionist, but one whom Cheyne calls an ‘advanced critic,’ that has taken this position; and the mystery, of which complaint is made, is just what we are trying to clear up. For I repeat that the present paper proceeds on Cheyne’s own canon, “not: Is there any reason why this or that prophecy should not be by Isaiah? but, What is the period in which, by historical or social situation, language, rhythm, and ideas, the composition of the prophecy can most easily be understood?” So far it is plain that all the four points in the historical situation described meet in Sennacherib; to the best of my knowledge and belief, they *all* meet in no one else.

We pass to an examination of the religious references. Verse 13 mentions *Har-Moedh*, the mount of congregation; vs. 9, 11, 15, *Sheol*, the underworld (cf. vs. 9, *Rephaim*, the shades; vs. 14, 19, *Bôr*, the pit). Since Friedrich Delitzsch’s *Wo lag das Paradies?* the view has been quite prevalent that Har-Moedh is identical with the Assyrian *E-ḫarsag-(gal)-kur-kura*, ‘the mountain of lands,’ the birthplace of the gods. It is curious to see how persistently cuneiform scholars until a very recent date have read into the latter a metaphysical element; the gods were “eternally born,” or “born in eternity,” or even “eternally begotten.” The original is simply *kiniš ‘aldu*, ‘were duly born.’ Jensen’s *Kosmologie* has made it very probable that while Har-Moedh is in the heavens, ‘the mountain of lands’ is on the earth; or rather, it is the earth itself, considered as a mountain. The masterly *Beitrag* of Gesenius, connecting Har-Moedh with the sacred mountain which many ancients located in the uttermost north, still stands; but it is not yet proven that the Assyrians or Babylonians held this conception. At the same time Jensen himself admits that our passage, being put into the mouth of the great king, refers to *some* religious idea foreign to Israel; he connects it with the Sabeian conception of the mountain of light, which he identifies with the Assyrian myth that places the celestial Bêl at the North

pole of the heavens. So Gunkel (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 132): **הַר-מִזְרֵחַ** "seems to have been originally the North pole, around which the stars revolve. See Indian and Iranian parallels in Dillmann, *Genesis*, sixth edition." The whole subject deserves, and will repay, the most searching investigation; the point just now before us is the question whether this Assyrian conception was so widely diffused in the time of Sennacherib that it might have come to the knowledge of a Hebrew prophet. The answer is in the affirmative; for the very passage cited by Jensen is from Sargon's annals which were inscribed on the halls of his palace. The possible opportunities for contact with Assyria on the part of a Judean prophet in the days of Sargon and Sennacherib are obvious.

With regard to *Sheol*, *Bôr*, and *Rephaim*, it is manifest that the ideas so graphically pictured in the ode before us were current among the Assyrians. The great popular poem on the descent of Ishtar is so familiar as to need only a passing reference. One of the Assyrian words for the underworld is *Aralû*, and this occurs in Sargon's Khorsabad inscription. The valuable monograph of Alfred Jeremias on the Babylonian representations of the state after death, supplemented and corrected by Jensen's *Kosmologie*, should leave no doubt as to the Assyro-Babylonian atmosphere of the religious references in Is. xiv. However the question may be decided as to whether the Hebrews themselves obtained these ideas of *Sheol* as early as the time of Sennacherib (though I think the affirmative can be fairly made out), that is not the question before us. It is plain that our author wishes to taunt the great king with the failure of his hopes. "Thou wouldst go to the mount of congregation? Lo, thou art there — in the congregation of the Rephaim! Thy pomp is brought down to Aralû. Ah, Helel, ben-Shahar, how art thou fallen!"

The view of Gunkel is interesting and probable (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 132), that reference is here made to an early nature-myth, the giant vanquished by Elyon representing the morning-star quenched in the beams of the sun, like the Greek Phaëthon. A peculiar value attaches to this essay of Gunkel's in that it successfully controverts the assignment, as a matter of course, of all such material in our Hebrew records to an exilian or postexilian contact with Babylonia. In the light of his careful researches, we can examine impartially the well-known parallels between our ode and Ezekiel. These are certainly very minute and striking. They belong to Ezekiel's oracles against Tyre and Egypt (ch. xxvi.-xxxii.). The lamentation of xxvi. 17, beginning like our ode with the exclamatory **וְיָנֹס**, is called a

קִינָה, which answers to the "elegy" we have here. In xxvi. 20 Tyre is brought down with them that descend into the pit (cf. Ode, vs. 15). The prince of Tyre in xxviii. 2 lifts up his heart as a god (cf. Ode, 14). He has been upon the holy mountain of God (xxviii. 14; cf. Ode, 13). Egypt also (xxxi. 16) is cast down to Sheol with them that descend into the pit; and the nations already there are comforted at his fall (cf. Ode, 10). In the pit with Egypt lie the unclean and abominable (xxxii. 18-21; cf. Ode, 19). The nations round about form a gloomy fellowship with Egypt in the underworld (xxxii. 22-30; cf. Ode, 9).

Notwithstanding these resemblances, the differences are so great as to forbid the reference of our passage to either Ezekiel or his contemporaries. The use of the word קִינָה is of little moment; the structure of Is. xiv. is as beautiful and regular as the book of קִינֹת; while it is impossible to arrange the prophecies of Ez. xxvi.-xxxii. in metrical form. Moreover, the style of Ezekiel is extremely diffuse and repetitious; and this would help to explain the points of contact noted above, if we may suppose that the author has taken the themes of our ode and expanded them in his own manner. This will become probable further on. But the contents are different, as well as the form. In Ezekiel, as in the Apocalypse, the nations lament in sympathy over the fall of the great merchant city; in Isaiah, the tone is that of irony, constant and bitter. Here, as we have seen, the individual traits are clearly marked; there the king is a mere personification, "simply the representative of the genius of the community" (Skinner: *Expositor's Bible*, on Ezekiel, p. 252. The whole passage should be consulted).

The religious teaching, too, is radically diverse. In Is. xiv. 21 the children are slaughtered for the iniquity of their fathers; Ezekiel's individualism is in flat contrast with this (ch. xviii.). Even more decisive is the consideration that the downfall of the king in our ode is simply the punishment of his vaulting ambition; while all the chastisements in Ezekiel's oracles against the nations have a religious motive that is iterated and reiterated: "they shall know that I am Jahve." This argument applies as well to Ezekiel's age as to himself (Davidson in *Cambridge Bible*, on Ezekiel, p. xliii.). The same is true of the historical situation. The power of Babylon in Ezekiel's time is Jahve's instrument to punish the nations; but the conception that it is itself to be punished seems entirely outside his scope (so Ewald). And yet, no power except Assyria-Babylonia, certainly not Tyre or Egypt, agrees with the indications of Is. xiv. The result of

investigating the parallels from Ezekiel is thus to leave undisturbed the evidence that Is. xiv. belongs in the age of Sennacherib.

If it be granted that the ode was probably written at that period, the language and style, on careful examination, seem to point to Isaiah as its author.

Although the phrase in vs. 4<sup>a</sup>, "Mâshâl upon the king of Babylon," stands outside the ode itself, it may have been its original title; this would furnish no objection to the theory above presented. For Sennacherib, as well as Sargon and Tiglath-Pileser, repeatedly calls himself *šarri Babilî*, and this may have been as well known to Isaiah as to us (against Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. 81). Professor Rawlinson's contention, in the *Pulpit Commentary* on Is. xiii., that Assyria and Babylon were essentially distinct empires, cannot be maintained; see especially Tiele's *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, at the beginning.

Kuenen's chief objection (*Einleitung*, ii. 85 ff.) to the Isaian authorship of xiii. 1-xiv. 23, is that the whole impression is that of a *contemporary* picture, not a prediction of the fall of some future king of Babylon. This of course does not touch the reference to Sennacherib. He next adduces:

(a) The style, which he regards as more easy and flowing than Isaiah's; a matter on which much weight is due to his opinion, but with respect to which it is difficult to bring him to book. It may suffice to quote a single item from Ewald's account of the style of Isaiah, which might have been written for the ode before us; "true poetic ease and beauty, combined with force and irresistible power."

(b) The numerous parallels with spurious passages of Isaiah. — Curiously enough, every one of these parallels is with Is. xiii., not xiv.; hence they do not concern us here.

Cheyne's objections in his *Introduction* also rest on the connection of our passage with xiii. 1-xiv. 3. They are mostly of some force against those who hold to the Isaian authorship of the whole, but not against the position of this paper. He mentions further (p. 70) the adoption of the popular idea of *Sheol*, the myth of the morning-star as son of the dawn, the allusion to the divine mountain in the north; but, as we have seen, the prophet simply puts these into the mouth of the heathen king. He adds a miscellaneous and bewildering collection of word-parallels to be explained away, and others to support his conclusion.<sup>2</sup> Now one may easily convince himself that

<sup>2</sup> One of these last is מַשְׁאֵל, xiv. 5, which he refers to non-Israelites as a class, citing (p. 73) Is. xiii. 11, xxvi. 10; Hab. i. 13; Ps. ix. 6. But this last place,

this is a very unfair presentation of the evidence from language, which, both in the mass and in detail, shows a remarkable affinity with the generally acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah. I have prepared a full vocabulary of xiv. 4–22, from which it appears that the total number of different words is 138. Among these are 6 ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, which are colorless for the present purpose, leaving 132 used elsewhere; 109 of these, or 83 per cent, occur in Isaiah A, that is, in the parts commonly reckoned genuine, which comprise only three-eighths of the whole book.<sup>3</sup> This fact becomes still more significant when we note that 17 of the remaining 23 words are in the literature usually considered pre-Exilian, while 1 of the other 6 is the common word בּוֹר. There remain only 5 apparently late words:

Verse 9, רָפָאִים, 'the shades.'

" 10, מְשַׁל, 'become like'; צָרָה, 'narrowly look.'

" 11, נִצַּע, 'spread'; רָמָה, 'worm.'

In view of the cumulative evidence to be presently adduced, it is hazardous to assert that Isaiah may not have used all these. In the first three verses of ch. xiv., which I regard as of late date, out of a total of 33 words, 9 are absent from Isaiah A, that is, 27 per cent instead of 17 (in the ode). Of the 132 words in the ode (omitting ἀπαξ λεγόμενα), 27, a fraction over 20 per cent, are not found in Ezekiel. Herein is a marvellous thing. The vocabulary of every writer bears some relation to that of his period. Ezekiel is the only undisputed prophet of the Exile. His book is almost exactly three times as long as Isaiah A, giving so much more opportunity for these words to occur. How very unlikely that the author of the ode, if

where רָשָׁע is parallel to נִיִּים, is the only one that suggests any such class-reference.

A wider induction from the Psalms led Cheyne himself to make the contrary statement in this very book, p. 323, as follows:

"It should be added that lvii. 13<sup>b</sup>–21 contains nothing like a definite reference to the Samaritans; רָשָׁעִים in vv. 20–21 is the ordinary expression (see Psalms) for the lawless party among the Jews."

<sup>3</sup> Cheyne's analysis in the *Introduction* gives Isaiah only one-fifth (21 per cent) instead of three-eighths. Those who follow his processes will probably disintegrate the book still further. By using the conventional division, I express no opinion as to any part of the remaining five-eighths; I simply refrain from drawing any parallels thence. It is convenient to remember that the present arrangement reverses, roughly speaking, the original antilegomena of a century ago (Isaian, 39 chapters; un-Isaian, 27), which has become Isaian, 27; un-Isaian, 39. These last (neglecting fractions) are ch. xiii., xiv., xxiv.–xxvii., xxxiv.–lxvi.



himself exilian, should coincide more closely in diction with a writer one hundred and fifty years before him than with Ezekiel!

The same contrast meets us in style as in vocabulary. The style of Ezekiel is ornate, elaborate, and artistic, apart from its abundant repetitions. That of Isaiah is simple, direct, and sublime, characterized by the "profoundest poetic emotion and purest feeling," "everywhere bearing the impress of a regal mastery of his matter." "Everywhere it rolls onward in a full, overwhelming stream, and always accomplishes its purpose at the right point with simple means." "Without becoming prolix, he thoroughly exhausts and finishes everything he handles." These quotations from Ewald help us to realize the contrast between our ode and the continual repetition of Ez. xxxii., or the geographical particulars of ch. xxvii.

A well-known mark of Isaiah's style is his fondness for paronomasia. Dr. Casanowicz, in his article on "Paronomasia in the Old Testament" (JOURNAL, 1893, Part II.), gives separately the number of cases of the occurrence of this rhetorical figure in each book. Isaiah contains many more than any other, namely, 130. The ode has 3 cases (1 in vs. 16, 2 in vs. 22), and this is just about what we should expect if Isaiah wrote it.

But the true bearing of the evidence from language cannot be seen until we come down to particulars, and note the many words, forms, phrases, and ideas which connect themselves with the historical Isaiah of Jerusalem.

*Verse 4.* The form נָשׁ occurs in iii. 12 and ix. 3. In the latter, the context is similar, as we shall see. רָרַב, the root of מְרַרְרָה, appears with נָשׁ in iii. 5 and with שָׁבַת in xxx. 7, "the blusterer is at rest"; so here, "how has the blustering ceased" (same words).

*Verse 5.* מַטֵּה = ix. 3, with נָשׁ. שִׁבְט is there too, but שָׁבַר is changed to הִתֵּן. "Thou hast broken the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor." Here the oppressor ceases; for He hath broken the staff of the wicked; the sceptre of the rulers. A different author, with Isaiah's text before him, would have been sure to write שָׁבַר. Cf. x. 24-27, where the ideas are the same, and many of the words. Cf. also xiv. 29, the rod (שִׁבְט) that smote thee is broken.

*Verse 6.* מַכֶּה, the same participial form, is in xiv. 29, just cited. The ideas are absolutely parallel. So again in x. 5, 6, Asshur is Jahve's שִׁבְט and מַטֵּה whom he sends against the people of his עֲבָרָה. In i. 6 there is a coincidence of thought which would never have occurred to an imitator. Here Asshur smites the nations (of which Israel is one) by blows without cessation; there Asshur smites Israel with fresh stripes from head to foot with no mollification. xxx. 26 belongs to the same habit of thought; Jahve binds up the שָׁבַר of his people and heals their מַכָּה. The cognate accusative (מַכָּה מַכָּה) is also in Isaiah's manner (see v. 1, 6, viii. 10, 10).

*Verse 7.* שָׁקֵט occurs in the same sense at vii. 4, xviii. 4, xxx. 15, xxxii. 17.

כָּל־הָאָרֶץ is given by Dillmann as characteristic of Isaiah, though he denies the Isaian authorship of our passage. (See vi. 3, x. 14, xii. 5, xiv. 26, xxviii. 22.) Note the fine contrast with x. 14, where the Assyrian gathered to himself all the earth, which was quiet, because none dared oppose him. Here all the earth is quiet, because the opposer has been subdued.

*Verse 8.* Another instructive contrast. Compare the whole verse with xxxvii. 24.

There Isaiah brings the word of Jahve against *Sennacherib*, and represents him as saying: "I am come up to the innermost parts (יְרֵכָהּ, see xiv. 13) of Lebanon; and I will cut down (כָּרַת) the tall cedars (אַרְזֵי) thereof, and the choice fir-trees (בְּרוֹשִׁים) thereof." Here the *fir-trees* and the *cedars of Lebanon* rejoice against the *king*; there is no more one who *cuts down*. The Hebrew words are the same.

*Verse 9.* *Sheol* is personified as at v. 14. It is altogether gratuitous to say that its use in that passage implies a different idea. We, with our present eschatological imagery, might freely apply either figure to the same general concept. Cf. xxviii. 15, 18;—a covenant with death, and an agreement with *Sheol*. רֵיָּא is a favorite word with Isaiah. See v. 25, xxiii. 11, xxviii. 21, xxxii. 10, 11, xxxvii. 28, 29.

*Verse 10.* חֶלֶה is found in xvii. 11, xxxiii. 24. The ironical tone of the questions reminds us of xxiii. 7: "Is this your joyous city?" etc.

*Verse 11.* נָאֵץ is a favorite word with Isaiah (see ii. 10, 19, 21, iv. 2, xxiii. 9).

But still more characteristic than the word is the thought—the abasement of pride—which is one of Isaiah's leading ideas.

*Verse 12.* נָפַל. Both word and thought correspond with x. 34, though the imagery is different. The one predicts the destruction of Sennacherib, under the figure of a falling tree; the other represents it as accomplished, under the figure of a falling star. שָׁחַר, 'the dawn' (see viii. 20). נִרְעֵ is characteristic of Isaiah. Cf. ix. 9, x. 33, xv. 2, xxii. 25. The context in x. 33 has just been noted.

*Verse 13.* יִרְכָּה in the construct plural, with the same meaning, *recesses*, recurs at xxxvii. 24. מוֹעֵד; cf. i. 14, xxxiii. 20.

*Verse 14.* דָּמָה. The word is found at x. 7 and xiv. 24; and, with the same shade of meaning as here, at i. 9. עָב, v. 6, xviii. 4, xix. 1.

*Verse 16.* The Hiphil of רֵיָּא and the form מַמְלָכוֹת are found together again at xxiii. 11. In xxiii. 7 the sarcastic question is even more closely parallel to this verse than to vs. 10. Another connection of thought is with x. 10, where Sennacherib boasts that his hand has found the kingdoms; here the shades ask if this is the man that shook kingdoms.

*Verse 17.* For the three successive anarthrous participles in 16, 17, cf. v. 20 (שָׁם as here). For the participle followed by ׀ and a verb, cf. vi. 2, x. 1, xxx. 2, xxxi. 1. For the thought, cf. i. 7, which is a special case of the general ruin depicted here.

*Verse 18.* The state of burial is represented as resting in one's house, cf. xxii. 16.

Our passage seems to be imitated in Ez. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 19–32.

*Verse 19.* נָצַר, cf. xi. 1. The word is found in only two other places, which evidently follow xi. 1; viz. Is. lx. 21; Dan. xi. 7. נָצַרְנָה. This very form (pass. part. pl.) recurs at x. 3, where also the thought is similar. בּוֹיִם, not a

common word, is found again in this chapter in the admittedly Isaian vs. 25, where Jahve vows to tread the Assyrian (Sennacherib) under foot; so here, *some* king is as a carcass trodden under foot.

*Verse 20.* This verse, as well as 18, seems to have furnished a model for Ez. xxxii. 17-32; for the leading ideas of these verses are repeated there, in varied phrase, after Ezekiel's well-known manner. Note קְבוּרָה, vs. 23, 24. So, Ez. xxxi. 16, "cause nations to shake" = Ode, 16. This last verse has the form רָאִיָּה which occurs nowhere else except Ez. xxviii. 18. The whole prophecy against Tyre, xxvi.-xxviii., has striking affinities with our ode and with acknowledged writings of Isaiah. See Is. xvii. 14, בְּלִקְחָהּ and אֲיִנֵּי, both in Ez. xxvii. 36, cf. xxvi. 21, xxviii. 19. בְּלִקְחָהּ is nowhere else in the prophets.

וְרָעַת מְרִשָּׁם. This precise phrase is found again at i. 4, and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. Cf. בֵּית מְרִשָּׁם (xxx. 2), noticed below.

*Verse 21.* בָּ, 'in return for' = vii. 23.

תִּתֵּן; cf. xviii. 3.

*Verse 22.* אָבָא occurs hundreds of times, frequently in Isaiah, but in no undisputed author of the exile, cf. *Bib. Sac.*, 1882, p. 538 f.

קוֹם עַל with מְרִשָּׁם is found at xxxi. 2.

Several particulars in the above enumeration have been drawn from Is. x. ; and when we look at the ode as a whole, we are struck by the resemblance between its tone and style and that of ch. x., where Jahve declares his purpose to punish "the glory of the high looks" of the king of Assyria, and foretells its accomplishment.

I would call attention, in conclusion, to the strength of the evidence from independent sources, to show that the chapter we have been examining is rightly termed the fourteenth chapter of *Isaiah*.

(1) The historical and religious references point to Isaiah's time more distinctly than to any other.

(2) The language and style give confirmatory testimony of the most intricate and convincing nature.

(3) The literary character of the whole piece is so elevated and powerful as to harmonize with the known writings of Isaiah.